

Message

---

**From:** Johnson, Martin@ARB [martin.johnson@arb.ca.gov]  
**Sent:** 7/9/2019 11:10:24 PM  
**To:** Melgoza, Elizabeth@ARB [elizabeth.melgoza@arb.ca.gov]  
**CC:** Huber, Stephanie@ARB [Stephanie.Huber@arb.ca.gov]  
**Subject:** RE: question about Imperial PM2.5 EI

Lizzy,

The emissions that Ginger cited (PM2.5: 0.2798 TPD in 2012; and 0.4073 TPD in 2021) are coming from an area source category EIC 430-995-7000-0000 not from point sources. The spatial surrogate for estimating the emissions in the nonattainment area for this category is a population split fraction. The growth surrogate is Stone Manufacturing Output which is pretty significant in terms of growth rate for the region.

Martin

**Martin Johnson**  
Staff Air Pollution Specialist  
California Air Resources Board  
Air Quality Planning and Science Division

(916) 324-5783  
mjohnson@arb.ca.gov

---

**From:** Melgoza, Elizabeth@ARB <elizabeth.melgoza@arb.ca.gov>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 09, 2019 3:32 PM  
**To:** Johnson, Martin@ARB <martin.johnson@arb.ca.gov>  
**Subject:** RE: question about Imperial PM2.5 EI

Hi Martin,

Yes I am referring to the CEPAM 2016 SIP version 1.05 for the nonattainment area.

And yes I believe Ginger meant to say from the Mineral processes category.

---

**From:** Johnson, Martin@ARB <martin.johnson@arb.ca.gov>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 9, 2019 2:50 PM  
**To:** Melgoza, Elizabeth@ARB <elizabeth.melgoza@arb.ca.gov>  
**Subject:** RE: question about Imperial PM2.5 EI

Hi Lizzy,

- 1) I assume you are referring to the inventory data behind the PM2.5 NAA inventory tool for CEPAM 2016 SIP Version 1.05? That is the latest data we have to support the SIP.
- 2) Also, our tool doesn't have a category called "Industrial Processes". From Ginger's e-mail, it looks like she is interested in knowing about the Mineral Processes category.

Martin

**Martin Johnson**  
Staff Air Pollution Specialist

California Air Resources Board  
Air Quality Planning and Science Division

(916) 324-5783  
[mjohnson@arb.ca.gov](mailto:mjohnson@arb.ca.gov)

---

**From:** Melgoza, Elizabeth@ARB <[elizabeth.melgoza@arb.ca.gov](mailto:elizabeth.melgoza@arb.ca.gov)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 09, 2019 2:33 PM  
**To:** Johnson, Martin@ARB <[martin.johnson@arb.ca.gov](mailto:martin.johnson@arb.ca.gov)>  
**Cc:** Huber, Stephanie@ARB <[Stephanie.Huber@arb.ca.gov](mailto:Stephanie.Huber@arb.ca.gov)>  
**Subject:** FW: question about Imperial PM2.5 EI

Hello Martin,

Would you be able to look into Imperial's inventory that we used for the PM2.5 Annual SIP in 2018 and see which sources/companies were included in the "industrial processes" category of the inventory? Please see the email below.

Any help you can lend would be appreciated.

---

**From:** Reyes Romero <[ReyesRomero@co.imperial.ca.us](mailto:ReyesRomero@co.imperial.ca.us)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 9, 2019 2:23 PM  
**To:** Melgoza, Elizabeth@ARB <[elizabeth.melgoza@arb.ca.gov](mailto:elizabeth.melgoza@arb.ca.gov)>  
**Subject:** FW: question about Imperial PM2.5 EI

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

---

**From:** Vagenas, Ginger <[Vagenas.Ginger@epa.gov](mailto:Vagenas.Ginger@epa.gov)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 09, 2019 9:37 AM  
**To:** Reyes Romero <[ReyesRomero@co.imperial.ca.us](mailto:ReyesRomero@co.imperial.ca.us)>  
**Cc:** EWeissinger@ramboll.com; Israel Hernandez <[IsraelHernandez@co.imperial.ca.us](mailto:IsraelHernandez@co.imperial.ca.us)>; Monica Soucier <[MonicaSoucier@co.imperial.ca.us](mailto:MonicaSoucier@co.imperial.ca.us)>  
**Subject:** RE: question about Imperial PM2.5 EI

CAUTION: This email originated outside our organization; please use caution.

Thanks for your response, Reyes.

Just for context, I working on the RACM portion of the proposal and I am trying to better understand which sources are included in the "industrial processes" category of the inventory, and why this category is growing. Within this category, there is a another category for mineral processes, and within mineral processes, there is a subcategory called "430- 995- 7000- 0000 - MINERAL AND METAL PRODUCTS (UNSPECIFIED)." This represents the largest source of emissions in this category, and it increases from 0.2798 tpy in 2012 to 0.4073 tpy in 2021.

If it would be easier to talk real-time, I can give you a call a bit later today. What would be a good time?

---

**From:** Reyes Romero <[ReyesRomero@co.imperial.ca.us](mailto:ReyesRomero@co.imperial.ca.us)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 9, 2019 9:19 AM  
**To:** Vagenas, Ginger <[Vagenas.Ginger@epa.gov](mailto:Vagenas.Ginger@epa.gov)>  
**Cc:** [EWeissinger@ramboll.com](mailto:EWeissinger@ramboll.com); Israel Hernandez <[IsraelHernandez@co.imperial.ca.us](mailto:IsraelHernandez@co.imperial.ca.us)>;  
[monicasoucier@co.imperial.ca.us](mailto:monicasoucier@co.imperial.ca.us)  
**Subject:** RE: question about Imperial PM2.5 EI

Good Morning Ginger:

Sorry for the confusion, the short answer to your question is NO, these two facilities (US Gypsum and Western Mesquite Mine) are not included in the PM2.5 planning emissions inventory, if you look at the last column in Table 5-1, it clearly states that the contribution of these facilities to the planning inventory in NA (not applicable because is outside of the nonattainment area).

I hope this help, if you need more information, please do not hesitate to call us,

Reyes Romero  
Assistant Air Pollution Control Officer  
150 S 9th Street  
El Centro, CA 92243

Telephone: (442) 265 1800  
Fax (442) 265 1799  
[reyesromero@co.imperial.ca.us](mailto:reyesromero@co.imperial.ca.us)

**From:** "Vagenas, Ginger" <[Vagenas.Ginger@epa.gov](mailto:Vagenas.Ginger@epa.gov)>  
**Date:** July 8, 2019 at 4:12:36 PM PDT  
**To:** "[monicasoucier@co.imperial.ca.us](mailto:monicasoucier@co.imperial.ca.us)" <[monicasoucier@co.imperial.ca.us](mailto:monicasoucier@co.imperial.ca.us)>, "Emily A Weissinger" <[EWeissinger@ramboll.com](mailto:EWeissinger@ramboll.com)>, Reyes Romero <[ReyesRomero@co.imperial.ca.us](mailto:ReyesRomero@co.imperial.ca.us)>  
**Cc:** Israel Hernandez <[IsraelHernandez@co.imperial.ca.us](mailto:IsraelHernandez@co.imperial.ca.us)>  
**Subject:** RE: question about Imperial PM2.5 EI

<b>CAUTION:</b> This email originated outside our organization; please use caution.
---

Hi Monica – Thanks for your response. I have a follow-up question for you. ☺ According to table 5-1 of the Imperial PM2.5 plan, it looks like US Gypsum and the gold mine are located outside of the PM2.5 nonattainment area. Are these sources included in the Plan's inventories, even though they are not located within the nonattainment area?

Thank you for your assistance!

---

**From:** Monica Soucier <[MonicaSoucier@co.imperial.ca.us](mailto:MonicaSoucier@co.imperial.ca.us)>  
**Sent:** Friday, July 5, 2019 1:33 PM  
**To:** Vagenas, Ginger <[Vagenas.Ginger@epa.gov](mailto:Vagenas.Ginger@epa.gov)>; Emily A Weissinger

<EWeissinger@ramboll.com>; Reyes Romero <ReyesRomero@co.imperial.ca.us>

**Cc:** Israel Hernandez <IsraelHernandez@co.imperial.ca.us>

**Subject:** question about Imperial PM2.5 EI

Ginger

Please see response in blue below

*Balancing Science and Technology to achieve cleaner air for a cleaner future*

*Monica M. Soucier*

APC Division Manager

Planning and Monitoring

P. (442) 265-1800

FAX - (442) 265-1799

---

**From:** Vagenas, Ginger <Vagenas.Ginger@epa.gov>

**Sent:** Wednesday, July 03, 2019 11:02 AM

**To:** Emily A Weissinger <EWeissinger@ramboll.com>; Reyes Romero

<ReyesRomero@co.imperial.ca.us>; Monica Soucier

<MonicaSoucier@co.imperial.ca.us>

**Subject:** question about Imperial PM2.5 EI

<b>CAUTION:</b> This email originated outside our organization; please use caution.
---

Hi Emily, Reyes, and Monica –

I am not sure which person I should be directing this question to, so I am sending it to the three of you. We're trying to better understand what is included in the following emissions inventory categories:

- 430- 995- 7000- 0000 - MINERAL AND METAL PRODUCTS (UNSPECIFIED). We were guessing that these might be portable/movable sources, but would like confirmation or correction. This appears to be the largest category within the mineral processes category.  
This is essentially, US Gypsum and the Gold Mine
- 645- 648- 5400- 0000 -UNPAVED ROAD TRAVEL DUST (UNSPECIFIED). Are these private roads and/or something else? These are the canal banks

Thank you!

Ginger